

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **9 June 2005** and in the Advisory Action mailed on **1 August 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-4, 6, 10-17, 20-22, and 27-32. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 10-17, 20-22, and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hoffman et al (USPN 6,640,240, hereinafter “Hoffman”). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman in view of Ben-Itzhak (USPub 2003/0023873, hereinafter “Ben-Itzhak”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claims 10 and 20 were rejected as being anticipated by Hoffman. Applicant respectfully points out that Hoffman teaches establishing **category-specific policies** for **replacing objects** in the cache with new objects (see Hoffman, col. 9, lines 48-61; col. 10, lines 20-23; and col. 14, lines 8-9). Hence, Hoffman discusses cache replacement policies.

In contrast, the present invention is not directed to cache replacement, but instead is directed to replacing **session** identifiers with a default session identifier (see page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 14 of the instant application). These session identifiers identify the user or client session to an application, a web site, a database, etc. This is beneficial because it allows the system to disregard the session identifier when determining whether a cached page from the first client can be served to the client session. There is nothing within Hoffman, either explicit or implicit, which suggests replacing one or more of the first session identifier or the second session identifier with a default session identifier.

In the Advisory action mailed on 1 August 2005, the Examiner avers that Hoffman teaches replacing session identifiers. Applicant respectfully points out that Hoffman teaches replacing creating a unique **content** identifier (UCI), which includes relevant parameters (see Hoffman, col. 2, lines 48-60; col. 6, lines 28-36;

col. 10, lines 20-23; and col. 18, lines 4-13). A UCI is different from a session identifier. A session identifier identifies the client or user of a session to an application, a web site, a database, etc., whereas a UCI identifies the relevant parameters of a session to an application. Hence, a UCI is session-specific and therefore cannot be a default session identifier.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 31 to clarify that the present invention replaces one or more of the first session identifier or the second session identifier with a default session identifier, wherein the first session identifier identifies a first client and the second session identifier identifies a second client. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 15-19 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 31 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-4, 6, and 11-13, which depend upon claim 1, claims 15, 17, and claims 21-22, which depend upon claim 14, claims 28-30, which depend upon claim 27, and claim 32, which depends upon claim 31, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 9 August 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665